



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

distance along the earth's surface. Even so crude a vehicle as a stone-drag enables a horse to pull for miles a load of rocks which he could not lift a thousand feet. Two horses will trot and pull a hundred passengers along the smooth metals of a tramway. Of how many horses would the strength be required to support the same car full of passengers in mid-air an hour, to say nothing of moving it along rapidly at that elevation? A force of ten pounds, advantageously applied, will move a ton in a horizontal direction. To sustain the ton in the air and simultaneously move it at the same speed in a horizontal direction obviously would require a force of ten pounds *plus two thousand pounds!* Here, again, one is constrained to ask: What advantage is it to put forth the enormous power necessary to sustain the freight in mid-air, when the weight might just as well rest peacefully upon the earth, the transporting power required being in both cases substantially the same? The whole absurdity originates in the unthinking notion that a bird on the wing weighs less than he does when sitting on a perch.

No triumph of ingenuity, no availability of new substances, such as aluminium, no application of electricity or other power, will ever enable man and freight to travel supported on the air more speedily or cheaply than, with the same advantages of material and power, they can be transported through the air while resting on the earth. So long as the force of gravity remains unaltered, transit through mid-air must, of necessity, be handicapped by disadvantages which no conceivable mechanism could overcome—disadvantages which forever preclude serious competition with transit on the earth's surface.

Flying-machines are among the near possibilities—an enthusiast might almost say probabilities. Man may yet harness himself into a light, tough frame-work of aluminium, and, compelling the electric current completely to his will, mount the ether like a lark or cleave the clouds like an eagle. But the world has as little practical use for flying-machines as it has for the north pole. Scientists would be deeply interested in them; the rich might conceivably use them as luxurious playthings; adventurous cranks would play mad pranks with them, not “before high heaven,” but in high heaven; and the managers of agricultural fairs and Fourth-of-July entertainments would hail them with joy as the legitimate heir to that old favorite, the balloon ascension. But the spectacle of a perfected flying-machine to-morrow curving its graceful spirals above the New York Stock Exchange need not shake by a ripple the watery instability of the most dropsical railroad stock in that hydropathic centre. The mass of mankind will live and move forever upon the earth's surface. The power that binds solid substances to that surface will never be defied or evaded to any beyond the most limited extent.

ARTHUR MARK CUMMINGS.

HOW TO TEACH CITIZENSHIP.

“OH, I NEVER read editorials,” was the reply made by an intelligent-looking young paying-teller in one of Boston's national banks, when asked if he had read a certain newspaper editorial dealing with a prominent economic question. Even more distressing was the confession of a young citizen, born and bred in New York city, in reply to a question as to how he should vote at the recent municipal election, that he did not know who the candidates were. When told that Mr. Grant was the Tammany candidate, he expressed the hope that he would be defeated, as he “never did like the Grant family”!

The writer's experience has not been unique. Certain it is that indifference to the duties of citizenship on the part of our young men—products of our school systems, public and private—not only as regards an intelligent consideration of questions of vital importance, but even in the matter of casting a ballot at all, is altogether too common.

During the Rebellion the appeal to arms for the preservation of the Union aroused the interest of our citizens and stirred the fires of patriotism. No such stimulus exists to-day, and the waving of the bloody shirt does not excite the passions of the generation of voters to whom the war is only an historical record. All the more need, then, to encourage citizenship by education. The filling of the offices of the government is still an inevitable fact, and there are still great national questions which demand the intelligent consideration of our voters. Furthermore, our population has grown, very largely by immigration, to such an extent that we now number, at a low estimate, sixty-two millions, distributed in many distinct communities, differing from each other in habits and customs, and even in language. In New Mexico the citizen casts a ballot written in Spanish; in many factory cities of New England clerks who can speak Canadian French are employed in the shops; in Wisconsin the exclusive use of the English language in the public schools is brought in question. Thus the immense task is imposed upon us not only of preparing for citizenship the children of American homes, but of inculcating the principles of our government into the minds of those children whose parents were born and brought up under other systems.

It is in the public schools of the land that the dangers of indifference and ignorance must be met. Much has already been done in the line of improvement. Civil government is being more widely taught, though it is not universally found in the courses of study even of our high-schools. The movement to place American flags upon school-houses has surely been an excellent one. But how does it happen that we witness so much indifference to citizenship among graduates of our public schools who are of voting age? How does it happen that intelligent men, in an intensely illogical spirit, advise young citizens to "let politics alone" on the ground that they are corrupt?—as if the filthy condition of the Augean stables were the best reason why Hercules should not attempt to clean them. If our public schools are developing a set of citizens who, forgetting that they owe something to the blessings and protection of a free government, and failing to realize that corruption grows on indifference, stay away from the polls because it rains, or submit to the indignity of being sent for with a carriage; if, as a result of public-school education, our young men are enabled to read the newspaper account of the baseball game without feeling inclined to read the editorial column, then the schools have fallen short of what ought to be expected of them.

Even if a law were passed making the study of civil government compulsory in all high-schools and in the highest grade of the grammar-schools, the remedy might not be effectual. The mere placing of a text-book in the school does not suffice. In the report of Superintendent Seaver of the Boston schools, for 1888, we find complaint made that the study of civil government had been neglected. The teaching of citizenship depends more upon the teacher than upon the subject taught. It is one thing to teach the Constitution of the United States so that it shall be *understood*: it is quite another to teach it so that it shall be *appreciated*. It is even more important to instil into the minds of young pupils a thorough appreciation of the ethics

of our government than to teach them an adeptness in answering technical questions with regard to its form.

In the teaching of citizenship, as well as in the teaching of morals, the teacher must be more than an unemotional machine in which a question is put and a fact extracted. To teach morals successfully, the teacher must feel the impulse to make the pupils better, and not serve as a disinterested distributor of ethical truths. So in teaching citizenship the teacher must be an enthusiastic patriot, one in love with the institutions of the country, who can *preach* patriotism as well as *teach* it. No point should be more thoroughly and repeatedly brought to the attention of those who are fitting themselves in normal schools and colleges to be teachers than that they are to have the future citizens of our country in their charge, and that they will be expected to teach ethics as applied to the duties of citizenship as well as to the other affairs of life.

Our scholars ought early to be taught that the wilful failure of a citizen to exercise the right of casting an honest and intelligent ballot is a neglect of duty and an ungrateful disregard of the privilege granted by our ancestors, who fought and bled that this nation might be a government of the people; that it is a sacrifice of manhood for a citizen to allow his vote to be influenced by an offer of money; that if the practice of buying votes were to become general, our country would become a miserable plutocracy, and to be an American citizen would be no better than to be a purchasable slave; that they are living in a country whose inhabitants enjoy the greatest measure of freedom accorded to any people on the earth, a continuance of which freedom rests with them; and that honest citizens must watch much more sharply for the preservation of the integrity of our government than political adventurers watch for the prostitution of its ends and aims. It is in the *ethics* of citizenship that improvement is needed in our public schools. If our children have been trained early to realize the responsibilities of citizenship, they will be attracted, as they become older, to an intelligent consideration of the great questions of the day, and will gladly turn to the discussions in our newspapers and magazines to learn what the best thought is upon these questions.

Much has been said of late about the attitude of the State toward private schools. Her duty as regards the teaching of citizenship is clear. The State is a joint parent with the fathers and mothers of the land, and may with right say to the managers of private schools: "Teach your children what courses of study you like, or what religions you like, but I insist that you fit them to be American citizens. These children enjoy my protection and the blessings of a free government. This government is conducted by its citizens, and these children, my future citizens, must be qualified to act as such. Teach them, therefore, along with your moral and religious training, the duties of American citizenship."

Ex-President Cleveland said at the recent dinner given to Mr. Thurman: "It should never be forgotten that the influence which more than all other things has made our people safe depositaries of governmental power, and which has furnished the surest guarantee of the strength and perpetuity of the Republic, has its source in the American home." True enough; but is not the school the ultimate factor in making the influence of the home patriotic? Our mothers can be the best cultivators of patriotism, and the mothers of the future are in our schools to-day. Shall not these mothers, then, taught in school days the fundamental principles of American inde-

pendence and the nobleness of honest citizenship, feel with Cornelia of ancient Rome that the most precious jewels she can show are her patriotic children?

SAMUEL W. MENDUM.

THE BRUTAL SEX.

WHEN Mrs. Poyser, in the course of one of her memorable arguments with Mr. Craig on "the woman question," wound up by admitting that, though women might be foolish, "God Almighty made 'em to match the men," she supplied a statement of the seemingly unanswerable variety which her sex have not been slow to make use of in discussions regarding the respective merits or failings of the sexes. As *Malvolio*, however, when questioned concerning Pythagoras's assertion that the soul of our grandam might haply inhabit a bird, replied that he thought nobly of the soul and in no way approved of the opinion, so I must declare that I think too nobly of woman to approve altogether of Mrs. Poyser's theory and assent to its proposition that women were made to match the men. If it were true, then the human race were in a most parlous state. If it were true, then the masculine would not be *the brutal sex*.

To be cruel is not necessarily to be brutal, in the ordinary acceptation of those terms, however lexicographers may decide the matter for themselves. A person may be both brutal and cruel, or only cruel, or, again, only brutal. In ordinary speech we distinguish between the two words by applying the term "cruel" to merciless acts which seem to imply a definite amount of deliberate thought preparatory to their execution, and "brutal" to similar acts committed without such thought and on the impulse of the moment. So it is that we speak of "refined cruelty," but not of "refined brutality." I have elsewhere intimated that women are often cruel; I should be sorry to believe that they could be brutal.

Cruelty is a defensive attribute of weakness; brutality the vice of strength. The exhibition of these two traits manifests itself early in our human nature. Let any one observe groups of boys and girls at their separate games, and he will see among the former the brute nature asserting its presence with more or less vehemence, according to circumstances, in a free interchange of kicks and blows, while among the girls he will observe actions that are cruel rather than brutal, and which involve mental rather than physical distress. But it is the brutal rather than the cruel side that comes into boldest relief. And among men and women the same degree of difference exists. The stronger sex is still the brutal one.

With brutality is often blended a vein of reckless generosity, a doubtful virtue, the exercise of which often serves to moderate or even dissipate in the public mind the effect of the brutality. But this is somewhat aside from the main theme. It is not needful to go back to the past to sustain the assertion that the masculine sex, taken in its entirety, is a brutal one. We can find proofs enough of it close at hand in our own time. Nor need we take exaggerated instances of it, such as now and then shock us in White-chapel atrocities or the acts of Stanley's rear-guard in darkest Africa, or in the practices of semi-barbarous peoples. We have but to look at existing states of things in the most enlightened nations of the globe.

Among the rougher elements that form part of the social structure, we find most inhuman practices to be of common occurrence. Men think little of beating their beasts of burden most savagely, and nearly as often and as